REMARKS

The objection to the Abstract has been addressed as has the objections to Claims 7 and 8 by way of non-limiting amendments.

The rejections of Claims 7, 8, 13 and 15 under U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 paragraph 2 are traversed, and reconsideration of each of these rejections is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to those claims which defines the subject matter in terms of acceptable product by process (Claims 7 and 8) or process claims (Claims 13 and 15).

The rejections of Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. of Claims 2, 4 and 28 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Sonntag et al., of Claims 3, 24 and 25 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Araga et al., of Claims 7 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Nomura et al. of Claim 8 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Fairbourn and Hocheng, of Claim 10 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Araga et al. and Kurosawa, of Claim 14 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Preece et al., and JP '870 of Claim 26 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Namura et al. and Eisner, of Claim 27 as being unpatentable over Sasaki

et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Araga et al., Fairbourn and hocking and of Claim 29 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Ueta et al. and further in view of Araga et al. and Kurosawa, all under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), are traversed.

Reconsideration of each of these rejections, each of which is premised upon the combinability of Sasaki et al. and Ueta et al, is respectfully requested. The Sasaki et al. patent is directed to an organic-composite coated steel plate to which a plated layer, a chromate-treated layer and a resin film layer are added. When these treatments are performed, there is concern about the occurrence of damage in the after-treatment process or the occurrence of corrosion at the faces of the steel plate.

In the present invention, the treatment is performed under the component transformation condition or after the assembling, whereby the concerns involved in the Sasaki et al. approach do not arise. Thus, with the present invention, superior corrosion characteristic are achieved. The Ueta et al. patent is directed to the starter having a contamination-proof structure of the sliding portion in which, to prevent rusting of the sliding portion of the pinion of the starter, a pressure in the interior portion of the starter and the atmospheric pressure is eliminated. That is, the pressure in the interior portion of the starter is brought to atmospheric pressure. This is far different from the approach of the present invention which provides rust proofing of the surface of the starter. The Sonntag et al. patent relates to a cyanide-free aqueous alkaline bath used for the galvanic

application of zinc or zinc-allow coatings. This patent is concerned with only a coating process whereas the present invention relates to surface treatment coating process. The Araga et al. patent is directed to a Zn-Mg electroplated metal sheet and the fabrication process therefore unlike the present invention which relates to the construction of the surface treatment layer and also the surface treatment method. Araga et al. is also inappropriate.

The Nomura et al. patent relates to a method for producing resin-coated rust-proof steel sheets with properties suitable for electrodeposition coating. There are concerns about the occurrence of damage in the post-treatment process or the occurrence of the corrosion in the section-cross faces of the resin-coated rust-proof steel sheets. In the present invention, however, since the treatment is performed under the component transformation condition or after the assembling, such concerns do not exist.

The Eisner patent is related to a coating process. The present invention, as noted above, does not relate to a coating process but to a surface treatment method. The same is true of the Fairbourn and Hocheng patents.

The Kurosawa et al. patent relates to a magnet and a motor component having a coating with improved anticorrosion and insulation. The present invention relates to the construction of the surface treatment layer of the exposed portion to the outer surface such as the vehicle mounted equipment (the on–vehicle equipment) and the surface treatment method therefore. Kurosawa et al. is completely inappropriate.

The Preece et al. patent is directed to starter motors, whereas the present invention relates to surface treatment. Preece et al. is irrelevant to the problems addressed and solved by the present invention. The JP '870 document discloses a manufacturing method of ultra-deep drawing cold rolled steel sheets and the chemical composition thereof. In the present invention, the composition of the steel material is immaterial as the surface treatment method is what applicants seek to protect.

Accordingly, early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #381NP/50961).

Respectfully submitted,

May 14, 2004

James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844